

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/764,293	SCHULL, JONATHAN
	Examiner Firmin Backer	Art Unit 3621

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Firmin Backer. (3) Seth Ostrow.
 (2) Jonathan Schull. (4) Gene Rrough.

Date of Interview: 12 January 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 58.

Identification of prior art discussed: 5,363,483.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed the distinction between the prior art and the inventive concept and argue that the claimed inventive concept is not taught in the prior art. Examiner argues that the claims as written fail to clearly convey the essence of inventive concept. Applicant proposed to amend the claim in order to clarify the claims.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required